Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/783,864	UEBERSCHAR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Katherine A. Bareford	1792		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Armo event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire land 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth atter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
NOTICE OF APPEAL				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Called	
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.1		ected claims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amondment (DTOL 324)	
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		inpliant Amendment (- 1 OL-324).	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 24-33,35 and 38-44. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:				
	/Katherine A. Bareford/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1792		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: (1) the proposed amendment to claim 24, last two lines, "enhancing the wetting of the curtain medium from the second curtain to the medium from the first first curtain by providing a negative pressure in the space" raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner, as this requirement has not previously been made. Furthermore, (2) the proposed new claim 46, last two lines, "stabilizing said first curtain and said second curtain by applying a positive pressure in said space" raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner, as this requirement as not previously been made..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (1) As to the 35 USC 112 rejections, the proposed amendment to claim 24 as to the description of the enclosing step does not overcome the rejection because as discussed in Box 3 above, the proposed amendment has not been entered. As to the arguments as to the rejection of claims 43 and 44 as to the confusion as to how the web can be paper or cardboard, the Examiner notes the argument that cardboard is a form of paper that therefore can be a particular version of paper. However, the confusion is not that cardboard cannot be considered a subset of paper, but that as worded, the claim indicates that "paper" and "cardboard" are different, as the claim indicates that the "paper web" can be "one of paper and cardboard" and it seems that a paper web would already be "paper". (2) As to the 35 USC 103 rejection of the claims, applicant argues that neither reference teaches "enclosing" the space as claimed. The Examiner notes that neither reference specifically provides the enclosing as claimed. Rather it is the combination of the references that provides the suggested single pressure differential system that has the same bounding elements (curtain mediums, applicator units, paper web, and suction/blower box) as discussed in paragraph 9 of the Final Rejection of June 4, 2008, and that position is maintained. As to positive and negative pressures, Finnicum notes that the purpose of the pressure differential system is to provide a vacuum (negative pressure to atmospheric) or positive pressure in the space partially bounded by the curtain..